Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
8/14/74

Mr. John A. Walsh, Managing Editor
Rolling Stone
625 Third St.,
San Fransicso, Ca. 94107

Dear John,

Response to your question of August 8 about Mr. Kaiser's work necessarily is opinion. My opinions are based on ten continuous years of long days' work for which I had a background as an investigative reporter, Senate investigator and intelligence analyst.

It is my opinion that the JFK assassination and its investigation is not appropriately the subject of journalistic gimmicry. It is my opinion that Mr. Kaiser has done no real work on this assassination and has displayed (LATimes Sunday magazine) a disqualifying prejudice against those of whom he would perforce be writing in your pages. It is my opinion that no one who has done what can be regarded by reasonable and informed people as real work on this assassination has advanced "conspiracy theories" as distinguished from addressing proof of conspiracy. And it is further my opinion that those who have been made into something when they are nothing by the irresponsible and inordinate attention they have received in the alternative press are at best nuts and too often the most dubious characters. That they may be sincere (and in most cases I believe they are) is irrelevant. Fact and truth ~~and~~ are what should be the controlling considerations. So, also at best, the kind of piece I understand you project would further obscure truth and would be unreal in that it would elevate these dubious characters who have done no real work into the symbol of all work and the small number of real workers.

The difference is between noise and music.

Mr Kaiser has already demonstrated an inability to discriminate or even report accurately in his piece on the CTIA abortion at Georgetown.

The net result of all the inordinate attention to these self-promoters and the frightful stuff they spew out is that no editor of any of the major media is willing to consider that anything on the subject is other than nutty. This also applies to politicians who at some point might help establish truth.

If you want to discuss this or anything that Mr. Kaiser or anyone else submits, my phone is 301/473-8186.

However, if you want to see an example of the kind of use that is regularly made of this fecal outpouring, read the motion just filed by the State of Tennessee in its continuing effort to deny James Earl Ray a trial. Samples are attached to it. Jim Lesar, 1231 4 St., SW, Washington 20024, may be willing to make a copy for you but he, as we all are, is unpaid for his work, which is the drafting of all the legal papers, so I would suggest that you not saddle him with the xeroxing cost.

What I might submit ranges from ~~extra~~ numerous articles to books. In fact, the fourth of the Whitewash series is now completed, is camera-ready except for the index, and may well be available for distribution. Subsidiary rights are also available. I am rushing it because of several areas of topicality. Tomorrow I see my artist on the cover. There are so many possibilities for responsibile writing without knowing your interests makes going into them by mail impractical. However, you now have a Washington representative, who would be welcome here, but an hour away. There would then be no question of "documentation" (a question you cannot have applied to any responsible writing on "conspiracy theories"). That you ask this question of me indicates that you are not familiar with any of my work, particularly my books.

In this new book I make short reference to a secret relationship I had with the late conservative Senator/Warren Commissioner Richard Russell. Some time ago I did a rough draft on this. It can be illuminated with some of his letters to me and with a fair number of documents still bearing TOP SECRET stamps. To his dying day he encouraged me to expose the failures of the Commission of which he was a member. I had put into his hands what caused him to break a long friendship with LBJ and to resign his CIA oversight responsibilities. He had forced a secret session of the Commission to oppose some of the Report. He believed that as always a stenographic record was being made. His objections were memory-holed with the device of a fake transcript. I ma using the first two pages of this fake transcript in facsimile in this book, but little else. If this interests you I can send this rough draft, which you would probably want to edit and shorten. However, I would like to know how you pay. There is an enormous amount of work invplved in this kind of investigation and obtaining these kinds of proofs. If the article interests you, you could then specify which of the proofs you might want to use in facsimile, if any. You cannot possibly use all I consider relevant, as your representative can see. In this investigation I obtained a copy of every record of every transcript of any nature so complete that I have the name of each court reporter and what he took in Washington and the covering letter with which each proceeding out of Washington was sent to the Commission. This is the way I work, to respond further to your question about documentation. I do not theorize in print on this turning point in history and the Watergate 1964 it represents. It is not merely to satisfy the demands of my own integrity or those of editors. It is also to leave an archive that will be beyond reasonable question for today's young people. (I am 61.)

In this book I also deal briefly with the fact that I am the writer who has made most use of the Freedom of Information law. The rewriting of this law by corrupted courts is largely by a decision in one of these cases. As a result the Senate has already amended it, specifically to nullify the judicial rewriting of the law in that of my cases that reached the Supreme Court. One reactionary judge actually wrote a decision in which he said I should be forever forfended from my JFK investigation. Neither major nor alternative media has ever mentioned this. I believe it makes prior restraint look like a first-amendment blessing.

In order to publish the first book on the Warren Commission I had to invent the "underground" book. By a strange switch, mine are the only available serious works. Interest in them is now greater than at any time since early 1967. The subject was a taboo, yet Whitewash became a best seller when I had no cent for promotion or advertising. The impossibility of commercial publication of this kind of work and the inevitability that enduring work commercially published bcomes unavailable is, I think, a story.

If you think my expressions are severe, I hope you can understand that my views come from the belief that the world turned the wrong way 11/22/63 and that all of history was turned around with it. Vietnam would have been different and LBJ and the new-deleted obscenity would not have been President nor would they have been succeeded by one I believe we can expect to rush us toward The Years of Our Ford. (I have much on Ford, some used in litigation, some in this new book and more in an almost completed Watergate manuscript, titled in April The Unimpeachment of Richard Nixon.) I am also aware that trusting editors who cannot be omniscient also can become the creatures of writers they have no reason not to trust. So, on this subject I do believe that editors should impose upon themselves the highest standards and the most considered of responsible judgements. If they do not the people are further abused.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg